

Orange County Public Schools

Sunset Park Elementary



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Sunset Park Elementary

12050 OVERSTREET RD, Windermere, FL 34786

<https://sunsetparkes.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jay Gangwisch

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	29%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gangwisch, Jay	Principal	
Connell, Andrew	Assistant Principal	
Althouse, Megan	Other	CRT
Reyes, Mabel	Other	ESOL Compliance
Jones, Carol	Other	Staffing Specialist
Turner, Debra	Instructional Coach	Math
Machado, Stephanie	Other	Reading Specialist

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	149	164	154	158	152	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	959
Attendance below 90 percent	18	19	15	9	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	36	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

66

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	17	17	8	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	47	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	3	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	23	17	17	8	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	47	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	3	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	74%	57%	57%	72%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	58%	58%	63%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	53%	56%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	68%	63%	63%	70%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	56%	61%	62%	61%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	48%	51%	47%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	73%	56%	53%	62%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	149 (0)	164 (0)	154 (0)	158 (0)	152 (0)	182 (0)	959 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (23)	19 (17)	15 (17)	9 (8)	14 (21)	12 (17)	87 (103)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (1)	2 (1)	0 (0)	2 (1)	0 (1)	6 (4)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (5)	1 (0)	1 (3)	5 (3)	10 (11)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	31 (32)	36 (47)	47 (33)	114 (112)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	55%	18%	58%	15%
	2018	69%	55%	14%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
	2018	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	62%	10%	62%	10%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	63%	10%	64%	9%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	53%	13%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	34	24	19	29	27	19				
ELL	61	55	48	59	55	48	58				
ASN	100	100		100	91						
BLK	85	62		80	75						
HSP	63	55	47	58	49	42	66				
MUL	90			80							
WHT	80	66	63	71	61	41	77				
FRL	64	68	70	63	57	45	62				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	34	32	28	26	40	36	25				
ELL	59	66	63	62	62	50	44				
ASN	74	54		89	85						
BLK	65	67		59	43		55				
HSP	65	70	64	65	63	46	54				
WHT	80	58	39	75	61	52	71				
FRL	65	62	64	57	63	54	48				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	98
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	76
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	85
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

On the surface, the component that showed the lowest decline was a drop in proficiency of 8% in Grade 5 Mathematics, however it is also important to consider these student's level of proficiency from the year prior when they were in Grade 4. When utilizing prior data that is specific to these students from their previous grade, we can see that the decline in proficiency is actually a much more alarming 12%. What this means is that out of the total number of students who came to Grade 5 demonstrating a level of proficiency, 18.56% of those students did not retain their level of proficiency. Grade 5 was departmentalized last year, and an interesting counterpoint to the dramatic decline of proficiency in math is an incremental improvement in ELA. Once again, on the surface when only evaluating proficiency level of the previous year's Grade 5 students, it appears that the proficiency level remained stagnant at 65%. It is important, however to consider the picture as you loop the data from Grade 4 in the previous year with the students. When viewing the data from this standpoint, the proficiency level did not remain stagnant, rather it improved by 2%. While this is a small improvement, it is demonstrative of the student capability and draws even more attention to the significant losses in Mathematics. What this now indicates was a weakness in instruction in Mathematics classrooms and a strength in instructional practices in ELA classrooms.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

Once again, Grade 5 Mathematics showed a decline of 8% from the previous year's Grade 5 data. It is also important to draw attention to one other area that experienced decline. Grade 4 ELA shows improvement from the previous Grade 4 ELA proficiency percentage, however if you loop the data up with the students then you can see a decline in Grade 4 proficiency of 4%.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

The greatest gap compared to state average is Grade 3 ELA which trends 15% above the state average. More concerning, however, is the smallest gap when compared to the state average. All gaps when compared to state average indicate above average performances, with the exception of Grade 5 Mathematics which highlights a gap of 7% below the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data components that showed the most improvement were Grade 3 ELA and Grade 4 Mathematics both with an increase in proficiency of 4%. When considering Grade Level Performance, however, it is also important to consider the Grade 4 ELA decline and also the Grade 3 Mathematics increase. This suggests a stronger instructional performance from the Grade 3 team as opposed to the Grade 4 team.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The main area of concern is Grade 5 Mathematics, followed by Grade 4 ELA and writing in both 4th and 5th Grade.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

- 1.Emphasis on data analysis and implementing data-driven instruction and interventions
- 2.Writing school wide is not a priority
3. Effective PLC Collaboration
4. Standards focused instruction and grading practices
5. Vetted and valid common assessments

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	SPES staff will use standards-based instruction from the Florida Standards focusing on rigor, depth of complexity/ text complexity, effective implementation of standards-based instruction, and using the collaborative planning process.
Rationale	Use of these standards, as well as the backwards design model, will ensure that teachers are planning for high quality instruction that focuses on a defined Depth of Knowledge (DOK) level and outcome for learning. Collaborative planning, as highlighted through the District Professional Learning (DPLC) process, is designed to ensure that all scholars in OCPS are engaged in rigorous learning activities that engage scholars in complex texts and critical thinking across all content areas. Current Sunset Park data demonstrates that there continues to be a need for ensuring the alignment and monitoring for both mastery of standards (proficiency levels) and continued growth (learning gains) in all content areas.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through the use of the District Professional Learning (DPLC) and school-based Professional Learning Community (PLC) process, individual teams will meet weekly with administration and instructional coaches to develop and plan for instruction using and analyzing data from both i-Ready and common unit assessments. Through this planning process, teams will work to target skills and strategies that will support the mastery of standards (proficiency), as well as close the achievement gaps (learning gains) as identified by the formative and summative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jay Gangwisch (jay.gangwisch@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The administrative team will monitor the standards based grading, iReady data, and formative and summative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using four data points to monitor for alignment will offer validity to our data and enable us to correctly set up intervention groups targeting specific student needs.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce Standards based grading 2. iReady data analysis training 3. Introduce common assessment collaborative planning and vetting process for the year 4. Monitor testing results and intervention planning 5. Correlate data points for validity of assessments and grading
Person Responsible	Jay Gangwisch (jay.gangwisch@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

The two other areas of focus will be on upper grades math and writing schoolwide. For math instruction we have hired a math instructional coach who has re-designed the math block with a 15 minute whole group followed by three rotation blocks of Standards: Focuses on a trailing standard (either the previous day's material, material that was recently retaught, etc.) that students should be able to complete independently, or at least productively struggle through. Computer: iReady. Teacher Led: A continuation of instruction from the Whole Group with either the addition of manipulatives or differentiation of instruction in some capacity. The end will consist of an exit ticket. Exit slips should be a formative assessment on the standard that was newly introduced this day to assess whether students have grasped the new content. This can simply be a problem that meets the full rigor of the standard.

Data that Coaches will track:

iReady: Diagnostics will be used as data points and administered 3 times a year (BOY-beginning of year, MOY-middle of year, EOY-end of year).

Unify: All summative assessments will be administered through Unify. CRM summative assessments are already created in Unify and only need to be released to students. Unify will automatically grade summative assessments by standard and disaggregate data accordingly by both class and student.

Data that Teachers will track:

iReady: Each student is responsible for 45 minutes of Instructional Usage time in iReady each week. More or less time than 45 minutes is not shown to be effective. Teachers should keep track of their student minutes and hold students accountable using a system of their choice. See example below:

Standard Mastery: This can be tracked through any means that the teacher chooses, however Achievement Task Cards will be provided for the first unit and PLCs will be provided with time to develop Achievement Task Cards for each unit moving forward. They provide an easy and concise way to track standard mastery as well as provide remediation and enrichment.

Writing will be implemented daily schoolwide. Our new reading specialist has redesigned the ELA block. The block will be 30-40 minutes: Whole Group •Teacher delivers explicit instruction and students follow along with activity while teacher circulates the room. •All mini assessments and unit assessments should be debriefed within a few days of students completing the test. This should be the teacher modeling how to find the answer, finding the evidence and discussing the text with students.

50-60 minutes small groups focusing on-

Standards: Students will continue to work on the standard that was being taught during whole group-activity can be different but should focus on same standard(s).

Writing: Students will respond to reading, practice RACE writing, peer review, revise writing, etc.

Computers: -AR (should be for just a few minutes)-i-Ready (students should do 45 minutes per week-no more than that)-Canvas activities like discussion posts.

Teacher table: -Students will work with the teacher.-Ex.Standards practice, reading comprehension, fluency, enrichment, vocabulary, phonics, etc.

5 minutes: Exit Ticket•Students should be completing a formative assessment/exit ticket to check for understanding.

Tests•Mini/formative assessments should be given before the unit assessment. •Grades 3-5 should use CommonLit.org to administer these assessments. It is free, grades for you and

allows you to compile some great data. •Unit tests will be from the CRM. All grades will be standards based. They will write the standard that matches each assignment they grade in the assignment title (ex. RL.1.2 -Theme -Monkey passage). Also, summative assessment grades will be per standard, meaning if the summative assessment includes questions based on 3 standards, each standard and the questions that match it will be their own grade so the summative assessment will show up as three different grades. There will be no retesting opportunities for summative assessments in reading.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Children ready to enter Kindergarten are invited to attend our Kindergarten Round-Up with their parents in the spring. During this orientation, these future Kindergarten scholars attend a class session where they work side-by-side with current Kindergartners. This opportunity helps to introduce them to our school, our staff, and the setup of a Kindergarten classroom. The future scholars and their parents are also invited to join current scholars for our spring Family Literacy Night and any other spring family events. Prior to starting school, the new Kindergarten scholars are invited to come for a one-on-one assessment with one of our Kindergarten teachers. This allows an opportunity for the teachers to get to know these new students and their academic strengths and needs. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice, and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by the screening data. Social skills instruction will occur daily and will be reinforced throughout the day through the use of a common language, re-teaching, modeling, and positive reinforcement of pro-social behavior. Screening tools will be re-administered mid-year and at the end of the year in order to determine learning gains, necessary changes to instruction, and intervention programs. Fifth grade scholars will prepare for their transition to middle school by having staff from both schools provide an orientation of the middle school program and review expectations. The scholars have an opportunity to visit our feeder middle school and learn how the middle school program works. Prior to the fifth grade transition, parents are provided with an orientation at the school. Parents are also provided a transition to middle school and beyond information session at the elementary school.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

The school-based MTSS leadership team will use the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) with teachers in order to create a support system for scholars not achieving grade level standards and/ or falling into the "Early Warning" criteria. Implementation of the FCIM includes the following components of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Title III Services are provided through the district for educational materials and English Language Learners (ELL) district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners. The school-based Staffing Specialist and ESOL Compliance Specialist (ECS) provide services for identified scholars requiring additional support.

The leadership team works with teachers to ensure that all staff members are growing professionally and are increasing student achievement. Multiple measures/common assessments are performed at key points throughout the year and scholars' data will be analyzed to determine specific areas of strength and any identified needs. Scholars' assessments help to determine each scholar's overall level of need. Once a level of need has been established, grade levels will perform an analysis of data to determine key targeted skills or strands that need further attention. Data analysis helps to highlight strengths and needs of both the teachers and scholars. Weekly Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings provide a forum for teachers, coaches, and administrators to discuss data trends and analysis, as well as develop intervention plans specific to the needs of each Tier II and Tier III scholar. Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) funds are used to support supplemental instructional opportunities for scholars in grades K-5 who are identified in our bottom 25% (scoring below the proficiency level) and/or new scholars that are currently receiving Tier II and Tier III interventions on the Reading MTSS system.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

This section is required for secondary schools, per Sections 1003.413(2)(g),(h), and (j) and 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: SPES staff will use standards-based instruction from the Florida Standards focusing on rigor, depth of complexity/ text complexity, effective implementation of standards-based instruction, and using the collaborative planning process.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00